

Serial No. 09/753,576
Docket No. FJ-2000-037US
(MAS.004)

13

APPLICANT INITIATED INTERVIEW REQUEST

Applicant's representative respectfully requests a telephonic interview with Examiner Gevell V. Selby in the above mentioned application in accordance with M.P.E.P. § 713.01(III), to discuss the Amendments to place the application in condition for allowance and the Remarks set forth below, at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Examiner Selby kindly is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the local telephone number listed below (or at Applicant's representative's direct number at 703-761-7623) to arrange for the telephonic interview at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment is proper because it does not raise any new issues requiring further search by the Examiner, narrows the issues on appeal, and is believed to place the present application in condition for immediate allowance.

An excess claim fee payment letter is submitted herewith for one (1) excess independent claim.

Claims 1-8, 10-31, 33-44 are all of the claims pending in the present application. Claims 1, 10, 31, 33, and 44 are independent.

I. ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Applicant gratefully acknowledges that **claims 10, 31, and 33** would be allowable if rewritten in independent form.

While Applicant believes that all of the claims are patentable over the cited references, to speed prosecution and place the present application in condition for allowance, allowable claims 10, 31, and 33 have been rewritten in independent form.

Thus, independent claims 10, 31, and 33 should be allowed.

Serial No. 09/753,576
Docket No. FJ-2000-037US
(MAS.004)

14

Claims 9 and 32 correspondingly have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer to the filing of a divisional application directed to the subject matter of these claims.

Claims 12-14, 16, 23, 24, 26-29, 31, 41, and 42 have been amended merely to change their dependency from claim 9 to allowable claim 10. Thus, claims 10-31, 41, and 42 should now be allowed.

Claims 34-38 also have been amended merely to change their dependency from claim 32 to allowable claim 33. Thus, claims 33-38 should now be allowed.

Claim 1 has been amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claim 10. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be allowed for somewhat similar reasons as allowable claim 10. Claims 2-8, 39, 40, and 43 also should be allowed by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim also 44 has been amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claims 10 and 33. Thus, claim 44 is believed to be allowed for somewhat similar reasons as allowable claims 10 and 33.

It is noted that the claim amendments are made only for more particularly pointing out the invention and placing the application in condition for allowance, and not for distinguishing the invention over the prior art, narrowing the claims or for any statutory requirements of patentability. Further, Applicant specifically states that no amendment to any claim herein should be construed as a disclaimer of any interest in or right to an equivalent of any element or feature of the amended claim.

Serial No. 09/753,576
Docket No. FJ-2000-037US
(MAS.004)

15

II. THE PRIOR ART REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 9, and 32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Matsumoto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,833,861; hereinafter "Matsumoto").

Claims 1-5, 8, 9, 11-13, 23-26, 32, 34-38, 40, 42, and 43 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,737,491) in view of Robinson, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,452,663).

Claims 6, 14, 17-19, 27 and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,493,828).

Claims 7, 15, and 30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi, and further in view of Tsukahara (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,407).

Claims 20-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Yamaguchi as applied to claim 14, and further in view of Robinson.

Claim 29 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Arai (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,758).

Claims 39, 40, and 44 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Allen in view of Robinson and further in view of Nagamine et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,564,070; hereinafter "Nagamine").

Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments above have rendered the above mentioned rejections moot, by virtue of the incorporation of allowable subject matter and amendments to the dependency of the rejected claims.

As mentioned above, while Applicant believes that all of the claims are patentable over the cited references, to speed prosecution and place the present application in condition for allowance, allowable claims 10, 31, and 33 have been rewritten in

Serial No. 09/753,576
Docket No. FJ-2000-037US
(MAS.004)

16

independent form and claims 9 and 32 correspondingly have been canceled without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 12-14, 16, 23, 24, 26-29, 31, 41, and 42 have been amended merely to change their dependency from claim 9 to allowable claim 10. Thus, the rejection of claims 10-31, 41, and 42 has been rendered moot and claims 10-31, 41, and 42 should now be allowed.

Claims 34-38 have been amended merely to change their dependency from claim 32 to allowable claim 33. Thus, the rejection of claims 33-38 as been rendered moot and claims 33-38 should now be allowed.

Claim 1 also has been amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claim 10. Thus, claim 1 is believed to be allowed for somewhat similar reasons as allowable claim 10. Claims 2-8, 39, 40, and 43 also should be allowed by virtue of their dependency from claim 1.

Claim 44 has been amended to include somewhat similar features as allowable claims 10 and 33. Thus, claim 44 is believed to be allowed for somewhat similar reasons as allowable claims 10 and 33.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments above have rendered the above mentioned rejections moot, by virtue of the incorporation of allowable subject matter and amendments to the dependency of the rejected claims.

Thus, the Examiner is requested to withdraw these rejections and permit claims 1-8, 12-31, and 34-44 to pass to immediate allowance.

Serial No. 09/753,576
Docket No. FJ-2000-037US
(MAS.004)

17

III. CONCLUSION


In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that claims 1-8, 10-31, 33-44, all the claims presently pending in the application, are patentably distinct over the prior art of record and are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to pass the above application to issue at the earliest possible time.

Should the Examiner find the application to be other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at the local telephone number listed below to discuss any other changes deemed necessary in a telephonic or personal interview.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any deficiency in fees or to credit any overpayment in fees to Attorney's Deposit Account No. 50-0481.

Respectfully Submitted,

Date: October 17, 2005



John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672

Sean M. McGinn, Esq.
Registration No. 34,386

**MCGINN INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
LAW GROUP, PLLC**
8321 Old Courthouse Road, Suite 200
Vienna, Virginia 22182-3817
(703) 761-4100
Customer No. 21254

CERTIFICATE OF TRANSMISSION

I certify that I transmitted via facsimile to (571) 273-8300 the enclosed Amendment under 37 C.F.R. § 1.116 to Examiner Gevell V. Selby, Art Unit 2615, on October 17, 2005.


John J. Dresch, Esq.
Registration No. 46,672